Clifton, Bristol. Nov 13. 1844

My dear Sir,

At length, with tardy and ungraceful step & mien — the Reply to our Address ~~having date~~ of the 1st Dec 1843, arrives in England, — with the date, annexed to itself, of May 15. 1844 —; but, accompanied by a Letter from the Committee entrusted with its care, — bearing date Sept 30. 1844: being four months & a half, later than the period within which it would seem, on the face of it, (at least as printed in the Inquirer Newspaper, now before me) — that the document itself, with its then 130 Signatures, was ready for Despatch!

In the tone and character of the Reply itself there may be little to object. Indeed, with the exception of the second paragraph, which implies an ignorance of the question here which does not exist, — and which points at a "species of action to which nothing in the

14 Nov. P.S. I have just been favoured by Dr Dewey with a copy of his Sermon on Slavery which it was arranged in Boston should be delivered on the occasion of the meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society in its seventeenth anniversary!

Address has any reference — with this exception, I cannot say that the Reply disappointed any reasonable expectation, — while it publicly & formally expresses against Slavery, and even Slave holders, — sentiments of indignation honorable to our brethren in America, — and we may justly hope the harbinger of encreased determination of action by every legitimate means which may be in their power — more than this we could not have wished; — and less than this, the Reply does not seem to promise. We gratefully thank you for it. Honour and blessing to the men that cordially signed it.

But between the Reply & repliers — & the Committee to whom the case of the Reply was entrusted, — there appears to be a broad line of distinction in regard to any obligation arising out of the transaction, either on the part of those who issued, or those who were to receive the Reply. It is very apparent, that with those who appointed them, this Committee have taken a most unexampled & a most

undue liberty—! —

Appointed for the specific purpose of procuring signatures to a document publicly & distinctly adopted & approved — & thereupon to dispatch the same to its intended destination — these Gentlemen, so appointed, upon occasion of another Body, in reference to another transaction — having adopted certain proceedings, & made certain declarations, — for which they prepare to abdicate their commission — and on their own authority — (certainly without one particle of authority from the Body that appointed them) to permit those other proceedings, — having no relation whatever to the parties in England with whom they are appointed to correspond, — to supersede the document with those transmission they are specially entrusted! —

Not having ventured, however, to put into actual practice a design which they confess they were strongly inclined to; — it was then alleged to be their object to give another time for the signatures of those who had hitherto "doubted or delayed."

In pursuance of which very accommodating tardiness, — there being (as it wd seem) 130 signatures procured so early as 15th May — four months & a half were consumed, — without the addition, in all that time, of a single other name; — proof at once of the practical wisdom of their course, [redacted] in reference to their brethren at home, — and their delicacy of perception of what was due to their expectant & wondering brethren abroad! —

Is this the way that public business is transacted in your Country? — I trust, my dear friend, it will be found that at least 128 names (I do not see Mr Lothrop's in it at all) in the list will be ready to answer with an indignant, nay! — or, that as many of them as can be collected, will be found to disapprove & disavow the conduct of this Committee —

I have seen with unspeakable pain an extract from an article in the Boston Register — upon which our Inquirer here has based a very snivelling & dignified Comment. I suppose I need be under no doubt as to the authorship of the Article in the Register. Ah, it is indeed lamentable. would I could erase the name with which it is connected, from the pages of a volume dear & sacred to me next to the volume of Revelation itself! —

Your aunt, I trust, be at the anti

Slavery "Bazaar" at Boston. In the collection
(a pretty large one) sent from Bristol — there is
a little bagatelle sent by my little girl, — with
a sort of address to the expected visitors — very
suitable to her tender years: of course written by
Mamma. How I sympathize in all your
feelings & associations! — and how truly, with you,
I honour & love so much that is good, and of
auspicious promise, in your strangely circumstanced
Country! — I shall be expecting long &
welcome communications from You this Month,
on the return of your relative to England.

If is expecting to
read the outpourings
of a mind & heart
so pure & truthful,
so loving & so upright —
as those which find an utterance in your
most interesting Letters —

Mrs Armstrong & they Daughter unite in kindest
remembrances; — all your friends in Bristol —
would do the same — could they know I was
at this moment writing: — of you they have
but one opinion, — & that is mine —

Adieu, dear Sir, & believe me always
most sincerely Yours —
Geo. Armstrong —

Rev S. May Jun.r —

Ms. B.1.6 v.1. p.65

L
NO 15
A

From
Bristol
14 Nov.r 44

BRISTOL
14 NOV

20

For
Rev.d Sam.l May jun.r

ans.d by 17 Feb.

(Leicester)

Massachusetts
United States